



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/073,538 | 02/11/2002 | Rahoul Puri | 02453.0005.NPUS00 | 5233 |
| 7590 | 06/19/2006 | | EXAMINER | |
| Michael K. Lindsey Howrey Simon Arnold & White 301 Ravenswood Avenue, Box 34 Menlo Park, CA 94025 | | | NGUYEN, HANH N | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 2616 | |

DATE MAILED: 06/19/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | |
|------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
| | 10/073,538 | PURI ET AL. |
| | Examiner Hanh Nguyen | Art Unit 2616 |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 April 2006.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

| | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 1-6, 8 and 12-17 and 19 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Kloth (US Pat. 6,549,961 B1).

In claims 1, 8, 12 and 19, Kloth discloses a network switch including a plurality of processing engines (fig.4, multiprocessor system 20 comprises a bridge 24 and crossbar 80) comprising receiving a request for a connection at the network switch (fig.2, bridge 24 receives an access request from a processor 22 at block 40); assigning a semaphore to the connection (granting a semaphore 32 corresponding to an access request at block 46); storing the semaphore at the processing engines (storing semaphore in memory of bridge 24, see col.3, lines 30-32); at one of the processing engines, receiving an internal message including a semaphore value (

within a data access address received, a portion of address correspondences to a requested resource 28 is founded, see col.3, lines 55-60); comparing the stored semaphore to the semaphore value (bridge 24 examines a portion of data access address to determine to which resource 28 the access request is intended, then bridge 24 examines sephamore 32 corresponding to the requested resource 28 to determine if the requested resource 28 is available in block 44, see col.3, lines 59-65); and at the one of the processing engines, processing the internal message based on the comparison of the stored semaphore and the semaphore value (the access is granted to processor 22 if the requested resource 28 is available, otherwise, request from processor 22 is denied with a halt signal 34 (generating an exception response) , see col.3, line 64 to col.4, line 3. Each semaphore with its value corresponding to a requested resource is examined to determine whether the requested resource is available or not ; see col.3, lines 15-25 & lines 55-67).

In claim 13, Kolth disclose a FIFO memory for storing sephamores assignable to connections (resources allocable to processors 22 is based on FIFO requests from processor 22, see col.4, lines 25-30).

In claims 2 and 14, Kloth discloses pre-loading a memory with a plurality of semaphores assignable to connections (semaphores 32 are stored in memory, see col.3, lines 30-32).

In claims 3 and 15, the limitation of this claaim has been addressed in claim 1.

In claim 4, Kloth discloses de-allocating resources assigned to the connection if the stored semaphore is equal to the semaphore value (a resource 28 assigned to a processor 22 is released by bridge 24 if a sephamore 32 corresponds to a released resource 28, see col.4, lines 20-26).

In claims 5 and 16, Kolth discloses the semaphore is a generation count (semaphore 32 may be count semaphore, see col.3, lines 18-22).

In claims 6 and 17, Kolth has disclosed the storing generation count in the memory as shown in claim 5. Kolth further discloses terminating the connection (if the requested resource 28 is not available, processor 22 is recorded and halt signal 34 is transmitted to the processor 22 to suspend the execution, see col.3, line 64 to col.4, line 15).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 7 and 18 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kloth (US Pat. 6,549,961 B1).

In claims 7 and 18, Kolth discloses, in col.4, lines 22-27, as the processor 22 requests to release the resource, the released resource 28 is updated as “free”. Kolth further discloses a memory storing sephamores 32. But Kolth does not disclose returning the incremented generation count to a FIFO memory so that the incremented generation count is assignable to a subsequentlyly received connection request. It would have been obvious to return the resouce equivalent to the generation count to the FIFO memory so that the generation count is assignable to subsequent connection request.

Claims 9-11 are rejected under 35 USC 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Ooba et al. (Pat. 5,528,761).

In claim 9, Ooba et al. discloses a method of processing a packet received by a switch having a plurality of processors (fig.6A, processing a message command received at processors 2,3 and 4, see col.6, lines 3-7) comprising at an origination processor (processor 1, fig.6A) passing the internal message to another of the processors passing the internal message to another of the processors (fig.6A, processor 1 sends a message command to processors 2, 3 and 4, see col.6, lines 3-7); performing processing operations relating to the packet at the another of the processors based on the internal message (each processor checks its condition for receiving the message, see col.6, lines 5-8); and returning to the origination processor a response (processor 3 receives the message and sends back an ACK (a response) to processor 1) and including the semaphore for indicating that the processing operations are completed (processor 1 observes the ACK from the processor 3 and determines which of the processors are ready for receiving the message which , in this case, is the processor 3. Therefore, the processor with the label “3” is the sephamore received at the the processor 1) see col.6, lines 10-15.

Even though the message command of Ooba et al. does not include an assigned sephamore, but the message command designates one or more destination processors (col.6, lines 3-5). Therefore, it would have been obvious equate assigning a sephamore to an internal message with designate one designation processor in the Ooba et al. in order to determine whether the destination processor is ready to receive message.

In claims 10 and 11, the limitation of this claim has been addressed in claim 9.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on 4/4/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The response filed on 4/4/06 have been entered. The rejection under 112 2nd paragraph of claims 8 and 19 have been removed.

Applicant argues that Kloth does not disclose the connection to which a sephamore is assigned.

In Kloth , fig.2 and 4, a CPU 22 sends an access request for a resource 28 corresponding to a semaphore 32. Bridge 24 examines a semaphore 32 corresponding to the requested resource 28. If the requested resource 28 is available, access is granted to the processor 22 (see col.3, lines 50-65). Examiner considers the “access” to the requested resource 28 is a “connection” because the “access” allows the processor 22 to reach or communicate with the requested resource 28.

Applicant argues that Kloth does not disclose assigning a semaphore to one or more packets associated with a connection.

In Kloth, col.3, lines 50-67, after the resource 28 is granted to the processor 22, the semaphore 32 corresponding to the granted resource 28 is updated. This means that the processor 22 is granted the ownership to have its connection to access data from resource 28 and no other processor is allowed to access the computer network because of data corruption. Applicant is encouraged to read Pat. 6725457, fig.1, col.1, line 45 to col.2, line 25 for further detail.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hanh Nguyen whose telephone number is 571 272 3092. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30 to 4:30. The examiner can also be reached on alternate

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ahmad Matar, can be reached on 571 272 7488. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Hanh Nguyen



HANH NGUYEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER